

## New York Tribune.

First to Last—The Truth—News—Editorials—Advertisements.

THURSDAY, OCTOBER 14, 1915.

Owned and published daily by The Tribune Association, a New York corporation. Office: 150 Nassau Street, New York. Telephone: 1000.

Subscription Rates: By Mail, Postage Paid, outside of Greater New York. Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00. Single copies, 5 cents.

Foreign Rates: Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.50; 3 mos. \$3.50; 6 mos. \$6.00; 1 year, \$10.00. Single copies, 10 cents. Canadian Rates: Daily and Sunday, 1 mo. \$1.00; 3 mos. \$2.50; 6 mos. \$4.50; 1 year, \$8.00. Single copies, 5 cents.

Entered at the Postoffice at New York as Second Class Mail Matter.

You can purchase merchandise advertised in THE TRIBUNE with absolute safety—for if dissatisfaction results in any case THE TRIBUNE guarantees to pay your money back upon request. No red tape, no quibbling. We make good promptly if the advertiser does not.

## Delcassé.

Two men are mainly to be held responsible for the fact that France and Great Britain are to-day fighting as allies. One, Edward VII, died before the fruits of his labors were ripened; Théophile Delcassé has lived to see accomplished the great purpose of his life, a European coalition against the German peril he early recognized and long prepared for.

In two of the most dramatic crises of recent history Delcassé played a prominent part. The first was in the Fashoda crisis, when Britain and France stood face to face on the Upper Nile and Colonel Marchand, who a few weeks ago greeted Kitchener in Flanders, met "K. of K." in Africa and peace or war hung on the decision of the French government. The second crisis was provoked by the Kaiser's excursion to Tangier in 1905, when Germany and France played similar parts.

In 1898 Delcassé made the great decision for his country. France, having for a quarter of a century pursued a policy of colonial expansion which provoked quarrel after quarrel with Great Britain, at last stood frankly before the dilemma which could no longer be avoided. Should she renounce her ancient European aspirations, her longing for the Rhine frontier, and fight England for colonial greatness in Africa as she had in Asia and America, or should she compose her differences with Britain and retain her European policy born of 1871?

Delcassé never hesitated. He compelled his nation to suffer the humiliation of Fashoda, to give up forever the Egyptian dream. He brought France back to Europe. But at the same time he made agreement after agreement with the British, in Siam, in West Africa. Finally in 1904, by a general liquidation agreement France and Britain settled all differences and the road was clear for Edward VII to go to Paris and France and England to make their entente.

But Berlin perceived the drift of Delcassé's policy and of Edward VII's diplomacy. The cardinal principle of Wilhelmstrasse policy had been that France and England should be kept forever apart and Russia bound to Germany by a "reinsurance" treaty. Russia had already escaped; France and Russia were allies; if Great Britain were now to join France, German continental supremacy, which had endured since 1871, would be shaken.

Thus in 1905, on the morrow of Russian defeat at Mukden, the Kaiser landed in Tangier and Europe faced the first of the series of incidents which lie between Fashoda and Armageddon. After Tangier Delcassé was forced to retire from the Quai d'Orsay to save France, taken wholly unprepared, from a war with Germany.

But German diplomacy in scoring a brilliant superficial success lost a great battle. For at Algeiras not only Britain but Italy stood with France, and it was the Triple Alliance which was shaken. Germany had struck to convince France that she could not join with England, and Algeiras brought the two nations closer together than before.

After Tangier Delcassé temporarily disappeared. But France, then at last aware of the peril that overhung her, began the work of national regeneration which was revealed at the Marne. When the Agadir crisis came, France and Great Britain were disclosed as virtual allies, and before their combined firmness Germany recoiled. She was not ready for war, and the triumph of Tangier was turned into the disaster of Agadir.

Only once in this time does Delcassé appear in a conspicuous rôle. Clemenceau, as Premier, in one of the utterly incomprehensible domestic quarrels of French politicians, one day launched into a violent assault upon Delcassé, and his own ministry fell. After Agadir Delcassé reappears in the Cabinet of "all the talents."

Nearly twenty years ago, then, Théophile Delcassé gave the first decisive turn to European affairs which culminated in the present struggle. About his own personal fortunes have centered some of the most dramatic steps in world history. Ten years ago Germany recognized him as her most dangerous foe and struck him down, but his work had been done. In bringing France and Great Britain together, in removing the causes that kept alive their age-long rivalry, Delcassé created a barrier to German ambition which only war could force.

In German minds Delcassé was the author, the joint author with Edward VII, of the policy of "encirclement." He was the statesman who sought—and succeeded in his efforts—to fence Germany with an iron ring of foes. His policies and his purposes, to the German mind, made this war. History may write the verdict differently, but there can be no escape from the conclusion that when in 1898 Delcassé chose to go to London rather than Berlin he set in motion the forces that made another continental war inevitable. From

Fashoda to Armageddon will undoubtedly be the fashion in which the future will describe contemporary European history. The actual causes of Delcassé's present retirement are obscure. Possibly the failure of Allied Balkan policy, possibly questions of Parliamentary politics, conceivably ill health, traceable in part to the anxiety for his only son, a German prisoner—perhaps all these have contributed to this result. But his departure takes from the field the man who has, on the whole, exerted greater influence upon European affairs than any man since Bismarck. If France comes from this supreme test victorious and territorially again the France of the Third Empire, she will owe much to Delcassé. If she is defeated, his name may be accused hereafter. But no one will underrate the greatness of the part he has played.

## The World's Championship.

Form triumphed when Boston beat Philadelphia in the world series. The American League team was stronger all around than its opponent. Philadelphia won in the National League by playing steadily throughout the season, while other teams were doing well one week and going to pieces the next week. With one star pitcher, two star batters and one star fielder Philadelphia had little difficulty in beating the weakened teams in the older circuit.

Boston had far greater resources than that. Three star pitchers, three star outfielders, one phenomenal infielder, a more vigorous offense and a tighter defense. The scores of the five world series' games were a fair measure of the difference in playing strength—possibly magnifying Philadelphia's a little and under-representing Boston's. A longer series would have ended just as decisively in Boston's favor.

The fact is that in the last four or five years the American League has been drawing away more and more from the National League. The victory of the Boston Nationals last year was a flash in the pan. Of the last five world series the American League has captured four. The clubs which gave the older organization its prestige—the Giants, the Cubs, the Pittsburgh Pirates—have become enfeebled and demoralized. Old players have been retained too long and dry rot has set in.

On the other hand, the American League has been developing new talent and keeping the playing standard high. As an instance, Shore, Foster and Leonard, Boston's pitchers, were unknown in 1912, when the Boston Americans defeated the Giants for the World's Championship. All Boston's pitchers in 1912, except Wood, have disappeared. Yet the Giants started out the season of 1915 depending on veterans of 1912 and prior seasons, like Mathewson, Marquard and Tesreau.

Boston beat Philadelphia four games out of five. The Chicago Americans beat the Chicago Nationals four games out of five. The St. Louis Americans beat the St. Louis Nationals four games out of five. There are three other teams in the American League besides Boston—Detroit, Chicago and Washington—which probably could have defeated Philadelphia. The lesson of the series to the National League is therefore unmistakable. Reorganization, new blood on the diamond and a sharper standard of play are required to bring it up even again with its younger, more progressive rival.

## British Submarines in the Baltic.

It will be disconcerting to the German people to learn that British submarines are at large in the Baltic and engaged in harassing their trade with Sweden. A singular notion has hitherto prevailed, not among naval men, it need hardly be said, but among the less informed Germans, that the U-boats are matchless and that in submarine warfare none can rival German commanders.

There never was the slightest reason for this patriotic presumption. When the war began Britain was far stronger than Germany in the submarine branch of the service and by now the superiority must be overwhelming. Nor is there the slightest ground for the belief that the German submarine officers are more expert. They have been without competitors in the North Sea for the plain reason that their enemies had nothing to attack, German commerce having long since been driven from the sea and the German fleet not daring to venture forth from the fortified harbors. Submarine warfare served Germany well enough for want of anything better after the cruisers had all been accounted for, but the cruisers as long as they were at large did much more damage.

Only in the last few days have the British been active in submarine warfare on German merchant vessels. It is a sort of warfare that was hardly considered, even by theorists, until Germany set the example. The speculations of most British naval writers before the war show that no torpedo craft of any sort were taken seriously into account in discussions relating to commerce destruction. They reasoned that even destroyers could not conveniently take care of the crews of large vessels and that accordingly their activities in this way would be insignificant. The alternative of leaving the crews at sea in their boats was too cruel to be contemplated; as to destroying them, that was utterly unthinkable.

A good many unthinkable things have been realized in this war, and though it does not appear that the example of sinking vessels without due warning has been imitated by the British commanders they are evidently forcing the crews to take to their boats. If they succeed in carrying on at the present rate the result may be telling, since Germany now depends to so considerable a degree on her commerce with Sweden. And though it does not appear that anything like an effective blockade has been established, yet the condition that prevails is at least as grave a men-

ace as the pretended blockade of the British Isles. Germany ought to be able to assemble a formidable naval force in the Baltic, but the submarine is elusive and not easily dealt with in this way. Much mischief may be done before the Germans secure the comparative immunity they formerly enjoyed in these waters.

## Orderly Dance Halls.

New York's dance places, which suffered rather extensively from the muckrakers following the Eugenia Kelly case, will be pleased to learn that they are now all right. Dr. Anna Dwyer, a member of the Chicago Morals Commission, has been inspecting them unofficially, and renders the verdict in their favor. She finds them orderly and well regulated; altogether a good example to the country's second city, where the dance halls "are rather objectionable, you know."

Whether this recommendation will diminish the number of visitors from Skaneateles, Grand Rapids and Pocatello who come to this city and hie themselves to the Great White Way to learn the latest thing in naughtiness remains to be seen. Some cabarets and dance places have maintained themselves on a clientele of Broadway rounders and guileless ruralites by a reputation—sedulously disseminated—that they offered more gilded vice to the square inch of dance space than any establishment in this side of Paris, Berlin and Vienna in the days before the war. Fortunately they have not been truly representative of the public dancing places of the city. If they were, there would have been real reason to shudder at the "dance craze." Thanks to the vigilance of the police, the licensing authorities and one or two organizations which keep track of such matters, the average public dance hall is a tolerably well managed, orderly, decent place, and the young woman or youth who goes there won't encounter trouble without some amount of willingness to meet it. If that fact is going to hurt this city's standing with sportive visitors, Broadway may lose some traffic—but there will still remain Chicago.

## Fabre and "Other Entomologists."

It is perfectly true that Henri Fabre's inimitable observations in the natural history of insects were given to the world in a curiously picturesque envelopment, and that from simple statement of fact he often passed over to sheer poetry. But in rebuking his obituarists for putting Fabre among the great men of science a contemporary critic is less than just when he says that "to those who know something of how other entomologists do their work and record its results Fabre does not seem to have been exactly a scientist, or even a scientist at all if those others are scientists."

In the house of science there are many mansions, and why should those even who know of other entomologists grudge Fabre his corner? Fabre was first and foremost an observer. He was impatient of theorists; he was perhaps not a really first-rate generalizer. But if, as his critic complains, "he ascribed to wasps and ants emotions that they do not have," surely it was only in a fanciful way, and the "as if" was never for a moment in doubt. He was too keen, too conscientious an observer and much too clear a thinker to fall into the sentimentalism of such twaddlers about Nature as William Joseph Long.

The extraordinary delight he took in devout study was, it is true, what he desired most to convey to others, and indeed he succeeded so well that in reading his books Darwin found something of the same joy and fascination as in direct observation. It is significant that in their first encounter it was Fabre who was standing against the imputing of human qualities to insects, and Darwin who was obliged to defend the belief that they might have some tincture of reason.

It seems eminently fitting that Germany should have a little idea of what its submarine campaign has meant through losing some of its merchant marine.

Henry Ford might make a little speech on the subject "Should Peace, Like Charity, Begin at Home?"

"Montclair to sell cats"—Headline. To whom?

In other words, Greece is also "too proud to fight."

## American Tourists and London Exchange.

(From The Manchester Guardian.) A very important point in the American exchange question that has escaped notice is the difference made by the absence of American visitors. The manager of a well known London banking house, whose business is largely American, tells me that in ordinary years the vast sums spent by rich Americans in this country (largely in Bond Street) help considerably to turn the exchange in favor of London. It is estimated that from thirty to forty thousand Americans visit this country every year. Last year, in August and September, there was a great rush to England of Americans who had been stranded on the Continent when war broke out, and banks and tourist agencies had a very busy time. But this year the American tourist is not to be found. "Almost the only Americans who have come over," my informant said, "are doctors and Red Cross nurses and commercial travelers. Over 40 per cent of our staff have joined the forces, while one department which usually is enlarged at this time of the year to over twenty has been comfortably run this summer by six men."

## "A Word of Appreciation."

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: We wish to thank you for your fine editorial in yesterday's Tribune, and, indeed, for your whole stand on the woman suffrage question. These are very busy days for us, but we want you to know that we always have time in the midst of our campaign to send a word of appreciation and thanks to our good friends. HARRIET WELLS. Secretary Woman Suffrage Party of the City of New York. New York, Oct. 7, 1915.

## GERMAN TALENTS

## What Are They That an Irishman Should Delight in Them?

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Permit a reply to Miss Munson, who prefers Germany and sees benefit to us in her victory. I am as Irish as Miss Munson, I suspect; though born here, I have by direct descent from the O'Connors, of Galway, a right to speak as an Irish-American, so I ask what particular manifestations of "Germany's talents and civilization are more valuable to-day to the world?"

Is it the nameless mutilation of the English wounded—such as only hate and blood lust could explain? Is it the apparently organized terrorizing of conquered territory by striking abject fear into the civil population, including shutting of official eyes to the raping of women—which does, indeed, strike terror? Is it the prepared and deliberate slaughter of women and children in the Lusitania, blandly justified as both necessary and war ethics—especially after "warning"? Is it the gas fighting? Or the liquid fire? Is it the Dumba conduct and unscrupulous bending of all rights of others to serve German needs? Or is it Louvain? Or perhaps the sanction, to the Turkish ally, of his delicate attentions to the Armenians? If not, perhaps it is the time-honored German policy of spies and gold and the corrupting of any one who would sell out—all on a scale that was magnificent, and proved how sure they are that all things yield to gold. Perhaps she admires the universal, century-old German worship of the pig—from which comes the pork, in every form, that has, mostly, fed Germans in the years past. That diet, I always claim, produces an aspect of kinship with its source, which the upturned German nose seems the symbol of.

I don't love the English; they are not my friends any more than any nation with their record; but France and Belgium and the English notions of freedom, law, government and morals—how can German talents and civilization compare with them? And how can any sane person say that the German ugliness toward us lately (abandoned now partly out of policy and partly because her submarines are mostly gone) betokens either safety for us or evidence of her "talents and civilization"? Germans are like the Japanese—once one always one. Therefore, even our citizens of that blood are only provisionally loyal to us; they would not all be with her, perhaps, but none would be against her—except, perhaps, her political refugees.

If skill in the mechanical arts, in making two blades grow, in getting blood out of a stone, in being thorough and resourceful and determined, are to be linked with bloodiness of mind, and a hatred of humanity and a love for murder if done for the Fatherland, and a thoroughgoing "finishing" of women and children who stand in the way (particularly of the women), then let the barbarian thank God for his darkness; let the Hun and the savage plead that he is no worse than the "talents and civilization" of Germany. If that is civilization, and if that is the result of having talents, let us pray for ignorance and beseech the Most High to darken our understanding, lest we should acquire the enviable position that Germany has in "Irish" eyes.

I challenge the "Irish" writer I speak of to answer when or where any Irishman, drunk or sober, in war or peace, ever did the dastardly things that German commanders are proud of? I resent the suggestion that men of that race have anything in common with the acts of those whose talents and civilization are so admirable. The Irish were never child killers or "below-the-belt" fighters; they spared the women, and seemed to fight like a cornered cur; they fought face to face man to man, and neither gas nor liquid nor shameless scarring of the dead ever dishonored them. They hate England—justly—but I can't believe they are so degraded that the past performances of Germany seem to them like "talents and civilization."

Brooklyn, Oct. 9, 1915. F. E. J., JR.

## Irish-American Impostors.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: I have failed to notice any reference to an intention on the part of an Irish revolutionary force to "invade" Ireland, as described so graphically, nevertheless unconsciously, by your correspondent "I. M. P." in your issue of October 7.

There can be only one opinion formed by any educated or conscientious Irishman of the actions of those Celts who have identified themselves with the Germanophile propaganda; and it is that such agitators not only grossly misrepresent real Irish sentiment at home and abroad—more especially in Ireland, where there is a most intense anti-German feeling—but that they are the very embodiment and personification of political charlatanism, and I will venture to add, of treachery of the basest kind. Their brand of "patriotism" connotes such an alliance with the manipulators of "hoodie" and graft that their sordid, selfish natures seem incapable of rising superior to any other impulse than the desire to gratify their own Machiavellian proclivities; by making the Irish question serve as a perpetual source of revenue for themselves, even though their fellow countrymen at home should have to suffer as a result of what I unhesitatingly characterize as most contemptible traffic in spurious patriotism.

When Daniel O'Connell was agitating for Catholic emancipation he replied to the physical force advocates in words that have become historic, that he would not have the regeneration of Ireland purchased at the cost of "even one drop of Irish blood," and when asked what alternative he proposed he replied in dramatic (it might be almost appropriately said tragic) fashion, "Agitate, agitate, agitate!" and he kept repeating this sentiment expressed by one sentimental word until it had such an inspiring effect that agitation pure and simple has secured for Erin every great measure, from Catholic emancipation in 1829 to Home Rule in 1914.

All this talk of sending a force to "invade" Ireland is the empty frothing of the disgruntled agitators of the cheap variety pattern whose antics are likely to create as much impression on the real Irish in Ireland (who in the final analysis must be the people who will shape the ends of Irish political measures) as a "Punch and Judy" show would produce on a convocation of rigid and decorous Quakers or a meeting of devout Methodist ministers.

JOHN JOSEPH O'DRISCOLL. New York, Oct. 9, 1915.

## An Example for German-Americans

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Yesterday, looking over some old diaries of European travel in 1903, incidentally I came upon these sentences of our stay in Hamburg: "The rain held up so that we could drive in the afternoon. On the other side of the lake were many handsome houses with lovely grounds. It seems to be a wealthy city. Estates were pointed out to us whose owners had made large fortunes in America, but had come back to enjoy them." Are there not others here in America who would be happier if following their example? J. E. C. San Francisco, Oct. 8, 1915.

## "ALLAH MIT UNS!"



## AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITY IN THE WAR

It Is Now in Our Power to Assure a Complete Victory Over the Most Ruthless Despot That Ever Tried to Crush the World.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: As time goes on it becomes more clear that the war must terminate in one of three ways:

1. A complete victory for Germany.
2. A partial victory for Germany.
3. A complete victory for the Allies.

How may a complete victory for Germany be realized? If the drive through the Balkans is successful in linking up the Teuton line with Turkey, the Allied campaign in the Dardanelles will probably collapse, and Russia may lose heart and make a separate peace. Germany will then be able possibly to attack Great Britain in Egypt; she may conceivably be able to seize and hold the Suez Canal; she may ultimately be able to reach and attack India. In the west it may be possible for her, when the Russians are no longer a factor, to carry through a successful offensive against Paris and the Channel ports, crush France, and at her leisure achieve the invasion and reduction of England. The final outcome of such sweeping victory would be that Germany would control all Europe, all Africa, a large part of Asia, and would be mistress of the seas to a degree never attained by Great Britain.

How may a partial victory for Germany be realized? Through the complete exhaustion of both sides and the termination of the war in consequence. If the Allies are ever so exhausted that they are willing to make an inconclusive peace, it will not be after they have succeeded in pushing the Germans back into Germany. Should the exhaustion of both sides bring the war to an end, it will be with Germany in possession of much territory that was not hers at the beginning of the war, with her prestige and her power measurably enhanced, and her resources capable of being soon replenished and augmented.

How may a complete victory for the Allies be realized? Only by driving the Germans back into Germany and there wearing them down and wearing them out until they are compelled to accept the harsh terms that the Allies have declared a determination to impose. The raising of the Krupp works, the exile of the Hohenzollerns, the execution of the aged assassin von Tirpitz, the surrender of the German fleet and the seizure of the Kiel Canal are all items that it is reasonable to assume would be comprehended in any terms that the Allies in the event of complete victory would be willing to make.

The idea that the Allies might rest content with a partial victory may be dismissed as impossible. They cannot achieve even a partial victory until they have thrown the German armies back across the Rhine. Once they have done that, their ultimate and complete victory will be a matter of time and patience, and who can doubt that for such an inevitable and desirable end France and England and Russia will have both time and patience?

Now let us consider what this country's position must be in the event of a complete victory for the Germans. That they now regard us as unneutral, even as hostile, we know. When they have swept Great Britain from the seas and are masters of Europe, Africa and part of Asia, it is likely that they will refrain from paying off a score so easily settled as that with the United States? Is it likely that William II will neglect the easy opportunity to make himself Emperor of the World, both in title and in fact? What fat pickings the United States will offer to a nation omnipotent in arms, inexorable in revenge, somewhat straitened in financial circumstances and more arrogantly, insolently conscious than ever that might makes right and that they are the chosen people of their God! The outlook for this country in the event of a complete victory for Germany would be so dark that only such American citizens as Munsterberg, Ridder, Vierck and Francke, who might reasonably hope to be appointed governors of the newly acquired provinces, could derive comfort from contemplating it.

And in the event of a partial victory for Germany our situation would not be much better. Then we should confront the spectacle of nations still thirsting for one another's blood, frenetically occupying the breathing space with preparations for a renewal of the conflict, and so far as they had

breath to spare or to waste expending it in maledictions on the United States. For on both sides it will be known, it will not be questioned, that it has been our attitude that has made necessary this inconclusive, this actually cruel and atrocious peace, that has prevented the carrying through of the war to a decision which could insure permanent peace. Had we done what the German people demanded of us the complete victory for Germany would have been assured. Had we taken up the gage so many times flung in our face, the complete victory of the Allies would have been assured. But we, with the future of civilization, to say nothing of our own future, at stake, chose to remain neutral. By so doing we won for ourselves the hatred of one set of combatants and the scorn of the other. In the new frenzy of militarism that will follow the partial victory of Germany the United States will be involved, and our place and our fate in the inevitable ensuing conflict cannot be foretold. But as surely as that conflict takes place shall we have to pay our toll of misery and blood and tears—and it will be heavier than any that would be exacted of us now if we did our proper part.

How, indeed, can there be any question that it is the duty of this country, to itself and to the world, to its children and its children's children, to range itself definitely on the right side? I hear the interrogation, What could we do more than we are doing now? I refuse to believe that this great nation, actively taking part in a war for the liberation of humanity, a war in which her soul is already enlisted, could not or would not do more than she is doing now. To me it is beyond doubt that if she threw her weight into the scale the balance would come true.

If the Allies are completely victorious without our aid, we shall have nothing to fear from them except their contempt. But it becomes less and less probable that the Allies will achieve a complete victory without our aid. Shall we then sit passive, in our selfish and fancied security and isolation, careless whether the butchering Teutons and Turks exterminate the rest of mankind? We have felt that we owed no duty to Belgium, to France, to the Armenians; is it possible that we are too blind to see what is our imperative duty to ourselves?

President Wilson has succeeded in keeping this country out of war, and has received for this the commendation of the unthinking. Will not the verdict of posterity be that just because of his determination to maintain a peaceful, neutral attitude when civilization was fighting for its life he showed himself a man of short and narrow vision?

There is one man living to-day who is it absolutely in his power to provide that civilization as we know it and believe in it shall not perish—shall not be overwhelmed by the most terrible, ruthless, despotic tyranny that has ever cursed and tried to crush the world. That man is the President of the United States. Should he break off diplomatic relations with Germany by reason of that nation's partnership in the Armenian atrocities or for any other reason whatsoever—and there are reasons enough he would perform the greatest service to humanity that any man now has it in his power to perform. It is true that without any help from him civilization may triumph. But is he justified, will history justify him, in taking what is after all a gambler's chance, and while seeming to play safe, actually exposing his people and those who are of kindred ideas to a peril greater than any that has yet threatened them?

ARTHUR STANWOOD PIER. Milton, Mass., Oct. 11, 1915.

## Mr. Lansing's Politics.

To the Editor of The Tribune. Sir: Kindly inform me through your most valuable paper if Robert Lansing, now Secretary of State, is a Democrat or a Republican. If a Democrat, has he always been a Democrat? G. E. S. New York, Oct. 9, 1915.

In the sketch of Mr. Lansing which appears in the last issue of "Who's Who in America," issued at the time when he was counsellor of the State Department, no reference is made to his party affiliations. He has never been known in Washington as a party man, but there is no doubt that he now classifies himself as a Democrat.—Ed.]

## "ARMENIA"

Views of a Boston Commentator On a Tribune Editorial.

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: I have just been reading your editorial "Back to the Dark Ages," copied "The Boston Transcript," and want to tell you for the same. Thank God there is one to write such an article and a paper dares to publish it. I wish I could write that, or that I was twenty years younger, that I might talk it.

Would that the article could be reprinted in every newspaper in the country. If we can Americans be still while France, Britain and Russia are fighting for civilization, they not think what might be the New York and Massachusetts if we are prepared? HENRY W. HART. Boston, Mass., Oct. 11, 1915.

## Jewish Suffering and Armenia

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Reading your editorial of the 10th "Armenia," in which you rightfully condemn the Turks for the execution of Armenians, I wish to ask you what about Russia?

What the Turks are doing to Armenia is child's play compared to what Russia is doing to six million Jews, her own subjects. This at a time when about half a million Jewish soldiers are fighting for the Allies, many of whom have been decorated, who show their faithfulness. When the war returns home, cripples for the rest of their lives, they find their homes gone, wrecked by an outside enemy but by the very men they served, their parents killed, exiled, their wives and sisters dishonored, their children starved and wandering.

Such things happened to tens of thousands of Armenians. Is doing it to-day, and yet there is outcry from the American press. It was Ambassador to Turkey (by the way, himself a Jew) who protested against these massacres of Armenians. Was there any such protest from the American Ambassador in Petrograd?

You may blame Germany for what the Turks are doing. Can you also blame England or France for what Russia is doing? I also say that Russia is fighting for civilization. . . . I am not pro-German, as I am against militarism, but if that is the kind of civilization Russia is fighting for, then praise "German Kultur." I always thought the Tribune on the square, and hope you will enlighten me on that. A. PERLMAN. High Bridge, N. J., Oct. 9, 1915.

## Not Grateful to the President

To the Editor of The Tribune.

Sir: Might I enter a public protest against the rather fulsome praises of Mr. Wilson which we have heard the last few days, following the announcement that he would vote for woman suffrage in New Jersey? To judge from these remarks we women should be eternally grateful to our worthy President for having ended his period of watchful waiting on the suffrage question.

But we have no cause for gratitude in the case. Quite otherwise. Mr. Wilson, the Governor of New Jersey would never use his influence or give his support to a woman suffrage measure, would receive no delegates on this question, though the women of the state fought hard to have him do so. When he became President he tried to do so, to issue as long as he could. Owing to the militancy of the suffragettes he was finally forced to declare his opinion that it was not a national question, but a state issue. The campaign in New Jersey allowed him to pay their excuse for refusing his personal support to the movement. Yet even with a support in his own home state Mr. Wilson delayed until within two weeks of the election before he made his statement.

Let us remember these facts: A national election is coming in 1916; in ten states women will vote; in these ten states women are forcing the national candidates of either for or against a suffrage amendment to the national Constitution, and, lastly, these women will vote accordingly.

Women have won this fight for Roosevelt. We should not thank either Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Bryan or Mr. Wilson for climbing on the bandwagon at the last moment. MAUD MALONE. New York, Oct. 10, 1915.